B.   REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. By this amendment, Claim 12 has been canceled. Hence, Claims 1-11, 13 and 14 are pending in this application. The amendments to the claims do not add any new matter to this application. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed July 11, 2007 are addressed hereinafter.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6, 8-12 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Miida*, U.S. Patent No. 5,504,670. This rejection is moot with respect to canceled Claim 12. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14, as amended, are patentable over *Miida* for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to an apparatus for processing network device status data and recites:

"a storage device comprising configuration data stored thereon, wherein the configuration data indicates both:
a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, and
how to convert network device status data that conforms to a first data format into each of the data formats supported by the plurality of recipient devices;
a conversion mechanism configured to
process the network device status data that conforms to the first data format, and
generate, based upon the configuration data and the network device status data, report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices, wherein the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device."

The apparatus for processing network device status data recited in Claim 1 includes a storage device and a conversion mechanism. The storage device includes configuration data that indicates a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices. The configuration data also indicates how to convert network device status data that conforms to a first data format into each of the data formats supported by the plurality recipient devices. For example, suppose that a particular recipient device supports a second data format. The configuration data indicates

that the particular recipient device supports a second data format and also how to convert the network device status data from the first data format to the second data format. This may include, for example, the use of a transform. The conversion mechanism is configured to process the network device status data and generate, based upon the configuration data and the network device status data, report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices. Also, the report data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device.

Miida describes a system for collecting and providing information. The center 100 collects information from copiers 300 over PSTN 2 and provides information to terminals 500 via Internet 3. The information provided to terminals 500 may include recommendation information, for example, when to replace consumables. According to *Miida*, the information is reported to users via email or a Web page.

One significant difference between the approach recited in Claim 1 and the system of *Miida* is that *Miida* does not teach or suggest converting status data into specific data formats supported by recipient devices. In *Miida* the data provided to the terminals 500 is all in the same format and there is no indication that any terminal-specific data formatting occurs. The information may be presented to users via either email or Web pages at each terminal 500, but there is no indication that the terminals 500 support different data formats or that center 100 converts data into specific formats supported by specific terminals 500. Furthermore, there is no indication that center 100 stores configuration data that indicates both a data format supported by each terminal 500 and how to convert status data from a first data format into the data format supported by each terminal 500. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Claim 1 limitations "a storage device comprising configuration data stored thereon, wherein the configuration data indicates both a data format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices, and how to convert network device status data that conforms to a first data format into each of the data formats supported by the plurality of recipient devices" and "a conversion mechanism configured to process the network device status data that conforms to the first data format, and generate, based upon the configuration data and the network device status data, report data that conforms to the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices" are not taught or suggested by *Miida*.

In addition to the foregoing, there is also no indication in *Miida* that the information supplied by center 100 to terminals 500 includes "identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device." This limitation was originally included in dependent Claim 12 and the Office Action refers to FIG. 2, element 2 and Section [0156] for teaching this limitation. This portion of *Miida* describes the typical components of a terminal 500 and also how each terminal 500 is used by individuals registered in the customer-ID database 22. The customer-ID database 22 stores IDs of users and not terminals 500, and is therefore unrelated to the aforementioned Claim 1 limitation. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Claim 1 limitation "identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device" is also not taught or suggested by *Miida*.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, as amended, recites one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida* and is therefore patentable over *Miida*.

CLAIMS 2-6, 8-11 AND 14

Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 all depend from Claim 1 and include all of the limitations of Claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 are patentable over *Miida* for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 1. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 recite additional limitations that independently render them patentable over *Miida*.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14 are patentable over *Miida*. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Miida* is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida*. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over *Miida* for at least the reasons provided hereinafter. Claim 7 depends from Claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. As previously set forth herein, Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida*. It is noted in the Office Action that Official Notice has been taken that

XML "is well known in the art for its flexibility and extensibility." Applicant does not disagree with this Official Notice to the extent explicitly stated, but Applicant respectfully asserts that it is not well known to perform the specific XML schema conversion recited in Claim 7. Applicant therefore respectfully traverses this Official Notice and requests that the Examiner provide evidence in support of the Official Notice in the next Office Action if it is maintained.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* in view of *McGlade*, U.S. Patent No. 6,411,598. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is patentable over *Miida* and *McGlade*, considered alone or in combination, for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

Claim 13 depends from Claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. As previously set forth herein, Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida*. It is also respectfully submitted that these limitations are also not taught or suggested by *McGlade*. For example, it is respectfully submitted that *McGlade* does not teach or suggest a conversion apparatus that includes a storage device with configuration data for converting network device status data into formats supported by recipient devices as recited in Claim 13.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* in view of *McGlade* is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

/EdwardABecker#37777/
Edward A. Becker
Reg. No. 37,777
Date: 10/9/07

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110
(408) 414-1204
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076